DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 871 CE 059 811

TITLE	Workplace Literacy Partners for the Manufacturing Industry in Chicago and Cook County. Final Performance Report.
INSTITUTION	Community Consolidated School District 54, Des Plaines, IL. Adult Learning Resource Center.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	91
CONTRACT	V198A10501
NOTE	46p.; For a related document, see CE 059 812. Type on p.21 of document fades on right.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Literacy; Basic Skills; Competency Based Education; Curriculum Guides; English (Second Language); Industrial Training; Job Skills; *Manufacturing Industry; Needs Assessment; One Parent Family; Program Evaluation; Resource Materials
IDENTIFIERS	*Customized Training; Illinois (Chicago); Illinois (Cook County); *Workplace Literacy

ABSTRACT

A workplace literacy project had two goals: (1) to improve the productivity and efficiency of the manufacturing industry in Chicago and Cook County, Illinois, by providing workplace literacy instruction to workers who lack the basic skills required for their jobs; and (2) to improve educational programs to meet manufacturing industry needs by developing a curriculum resource guide. Seven original objectives were met (and sometimes exceeded): (1) literacy audits and needs assessments were conducted for eight original manufacturing companies and five additional companies; (2) assessment instruments were developed/selected; (3) competencies and basic skills were identified and customized curricula were developed; (4) 21 instructors were trained; (5) 1,302 workers were pretested and trained; (6) 86 modules were scheduled and instruction provided to 661 participants; and (7) participants' learning was measured. A final evaluation collected data through interviews, class observations, and questionnaires, concluding that companies were generally satisfied with the program and both workers and management liked the customized curriculum materials. Positive outcomes included increased productivity, attendance, and self-esteem. (Five charts are included: course statistics; list of competency-based courses--mastery required; cumulative data, competency-based courses; number of preassessments by quarter; and new courses opened by quarter. A final project evaluation and two appendices--site contact questionnaire and instructor questionnaire--are also provided.) (NLA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED339871

WORKPLACE LITERACY PARTNERS FOR THE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY IN CHICAGO AND COOK COUNTY V198A10501

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

Linda Mrowicki, Project Director

Community Consolidated School District #54/
Adult Learning Resource Center
1855 Mt. Prospect Road
DesPlaines, IL 60018
(708) 803-3535

Educational Partners: Management Association of Illinois
Township High School District #214 Community Education
Travelers & Immigrants Aid of Chicago

CE059811

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I. **Compare actual accomplishments to the objectives contained in the approved application.**

GOAL: *To improve the productivity and efficiency of the manufacturing industry by providing workplace literacy instruction to those workers who lack the basic skills required for their jobs.*

1. *To conduct literacy audits and needs assessments for 8 manufacturing companies by month 2.*

   Literacy audits and needs assessments were conducted for 8 original manufacturing companies by month. Literacy audits and needs assessments were conducted within 2 months of start up for 5 additional companies. The project **exceeded goal by 63%.**

2. *To develop/select assessment instruments for 8 companies by month 2.*

   Developed and selected assessment instruments for 8 original companies by month 2. Developed/selected assessment instruments for additional 5 companies within 2 months of start up. The project **exceeded goal by 63%.**

3. *To identify competencies and basic skills for 8 manufacturers and develop customized curricula by month 13.*

   The project identified competencies and basic skills for 8 manufacturers and developed customized curricula by month 13. The project identified competency and basic skills for 5 additional companies within 2 months of start up. The project **exceeded goal by 63%.**

4. *To select and train 15 workplace literacy instructors by month 3.*

   The project selected and trained 21 workplace literacy instructors prior to start up of courses. The project **exceeded goal by 29%.**

5. *To recruit and pre-test 1014 workers by month 13.*

   The project recruited and pre-tested 1,302 workers by month 13. The project **exceeded goal by 28%.**

6. *To schedule 68 modules and provide instruction to 664 participants by month 15.*

   The project scheduled 86 modules and provided instruction to 661 workers by month 21. The reduced goal of 664 workers and 68 modules was approved in July 1991 along with the no-cost extension to December 1991. The project **achieved 99.5% of the goal for participants** served and **126% of the goal for modules.**

7. *To measure the learning of 873 participating workers by month 15.*

The project measured the learning of 661 participating workers by month 18. Our reduced goal of 664 workers was approved in July 1991. The project **achieved 99.5% of the goal**

GOAL: *To improve the ability of educational programs to meet the basic skill needs of the manufacturing industry by developing a curriculum resource guide.*

8. *To produce the Basic Skills Curriculum Guide for the manufacturing industry by month 15.*

The project produced the Basic Skills Curriculum Guide by month 21. Because the Guide was the culmination of all project activities, the development coincided with the conclusion of the approved 90 day extension.

9. *To disseminate the Curriculum Guide by month 15.*

The project disseminated the guide in month 24. The guide was sent to ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career & Vocational Education, Division of Adult Education & Literacy Clearinghouse on Adult Education and Literacy, and the Curriculum Coordination Center Network.

II. **Refer to the schedule of accomplishments and their target dates contained in the approved application and give reasons for the slippage in those cases where established objectives were not met. Include any corrective measures taken to correct slippage.**

All objectives were met.

III. **For projects involving direct services to individuals, identify the number and characteristics of project participants who completed planned project activities and of those who did not, and the outcomes achieved by participants who completed project activities.**

DIRECT SERVICES

1. Mean Age Participants: 37.55

2. Sex: No. Males 310 No. Females 142

3. Race/Ethnicity: No. who are:
   White 61
   Black 87
   Hispanic 260
   Am. Indian/Alaska Native 3
   Asian Pacific Islander 41

4. No Single Head of Household 76

5. No. Limited English Proficient: 301

6.

Outcomes	No. Participants
a. tested higher on basic skills	235
b. Improved communication skills	301
c. Increased productivity	631
d. Improved attendance at work	631
e. Increased self-esteem	631

7.

Years with the company	No. of Participants
Unemployed	0
0-5	155
601	60
11-15	98
16-over	238

IV. Report any dissemination activities.

Presentations

All full-time project staff participated in the Illinois Secretary of State and workplace literacy conference on July 20. The EMD workplace site was featured as a model program.

On September 22, Monica Lynch conducted a workshop "Creating Classroom Materials for the Workplace" at the Illinois T.E.S.O.L. fall workshop. The audience was primarily adult educators interested in workplace literacy.

On September 25, Linda Mrowicki presented a workshop "Enhancing the Unskilled Worker" at a conference for human resource professionals, sponsored by the Management Association of Illinois.

Project Director, Linda Mrowicki, presented at the International T.E.S.O.L. Conference in New York in March.

In July, Linda Mrowicki presented a workshop on workplace literacy at the National Urban League conference in Atlanta.

In October, Linda Mrowicki presented a workshop "Designing Workplace Curriculum" at a conference sponsored by the Maryland State Department of Education and the Department of Economic and Employment Development.

Publications

Monica Lynch published 3 articles in the Illinois Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. The articles were reprinted in The Adult ED Connection: Newsletter of the Adult Education Service Center of Northern Illinois.

1. Manufacturing and Adult Education-Learning From Each Other.
2. Workplace Literacy Staffing-Key to a Successful Program.
3. Students are the Teachers in Workplace Literacy.

Onsite Visits by Researchers

The project staff had an on-site visit of Heide Wrigley and Gloria Guth from Aguirre International in San Mateo, California. The project was selected as one of nine sites to be visited by these researchers in the field of E.S.L. literacy.

V. Report on any evaluation activities.

Each class was post-tested with a customized criterion-referenced assessment. The results of this testing for each class are found on the following pages.

The report of the external evaluator is also attached.

Workplace Literacy Partners for the Manufacturing Industry in Chicago and Cook County

Quarter: October - December 1991

CHART A: COURSE STATISTICS

DATES	SITE	COURSE	INSTRUCTOR	# OF STUDENTS ENROLLED	SUCCESSES	FAILURES	DROPS	% OF SUCCESS
5/22 - 7/12	Bloomfield	Company Specific-Math & Reading	D. Jones	9	7	2	0	77%
6/11 - 8/9	E.M.D.	ESL Company Course	D. Jones	5	5	0	0	100%
7/30 - 8/8	E.M.D.	Job Specific Reading - Pick Tickets	C. Larsen	7	7	0	0	100%
7/31 - 9/13	E.M.D.	Job Specific Math - Warehouse	C. Larsen	6	5	0	1	100%
8/28 - 9/27	E.M.D.	Job Specific Math - Warehouse	D. Jones	8	7	0	1	100%
9/19 - 12/19	Briskin	E.S.L. Company Course	J. Juffer	8	2	1	5	66%
9/19 - 12/19	Briskin	E.S.L. Company Course	J. Juffer	14	5	3	6	62%
9/19 - 12/19	Briskin	Advanced E.S.L. Tutoring for Machine Operators	J. Juffer	4	4	0	0	100%

Chart A: Continued

Workplace Literacy Partners for the Manufacturing Industry in Chicago and Cook County

Quarter: October - December 1991

CHART A: COURSE STATISTICS

DATES	SITE	COURSE	INSTRUCTOR	# OF STUDENTS ENROLLED	SUCCESSES	FAILURES	DROPS	% OF SUCCESS
9/19 - 11/28	Shure - Wheeling	E.S.L. Company Course	M. Whitaker	10	6	1	3	86%
9/20 - 11/29	Shure - Wheeling	E.S.L. Company Course	J. Juffer	10	5	0	5	100%
9/26 - 12/19	Multigraphics	E.S.L. Company Course	B. Newman	16	9	1	6	90%
9/27 - 12/20	Multigraphics	Company-Specific Reading & Math	B. Newman	16	7	5	4	58%
10/11- 12/13	Shure - Wheeling	E.S.L./Instructors & Inspectors	J. Amaral	9	8	0	1	100%
10/22- 12/19	Multigraphics	Reading & Math	J. Oswald	14	10	4	0	71%
10/23 - 2/26	DuPage	E.S.L. Company Course	T. Locsin	14	7	0	7	100%
10/23- 12/20	Multigraphics	E.S.L. Company Course	P. Cleveland	13	11	0	2	100%
11/5-4/8	DuPage	E.S.L. Company Course	T. Loscin	15	6	1	8	86%
11/12 - 1/24	Bretford - Schiller Park	E.S.L. Company Course	L. Hebbel	10	6	0	4	100%
11/12 - 1/24	Bretford - Schiller Park	E.S.L. Company Course	L. Hebbel	3	2	0	1	100%

Chart A: Continued

Workplace Literacy Partners for the Manufacturing Industry in Chicago and Cook County

Quarter: October - December 1991

CHART A: COURSE STATISTICS

DATES	SITE	COURSE	INSTRUCTOR	# OF STUDENTS ENROLLED	SUCCESSES	FAILURES	DROPS	% OF SUCCESS
1/7-3/27/91	Multigraphics	E.S.L. Company Course	B. Newman	16	11	0	5	100%
1/8-3/28/91	Multigraphics	Company Specific Math	B. Newman	12	5	4	3	56%
1/8-3/28/91	Multigraphics	Company Specific Math	J. Oswald	14	14	0	0	100%
1/28-4/16/91	Bretford - Schiller Park	E.S.L. Company Course	L. Hebbel	6	6	0	0	100%
1/28-4/16/91	Bretford - Schiller Park	E.S.L. Company Course	L. Hebbel	2	1	0	1	100%
2/6-5/24/91	Bretford - Wood Dale	E.S.L. Company Course	C. Perillo	8	7	0	1	88%
3/12-5/24/91	Bretford - Wood Dale	E.S.L. Tutoring for Machine Operators	C. Perillo	3	3	0	0	100%
3/25-6/27/91	Shure - Evanston	E.S.L. Company Course	F. Ramer	9	9	0	0	100%
3/25-6/27/91	Shure - Evanston	E.S.L. Company Course	F. Ramer	9	9	0	0	100%
3/26-6/28/91	Shure - Evanston	E.S.L. Company Course	F. Ramer	9	9	0	0	100%
3/26-6/28/91	Shure - Evanston	E.S.L. Company Course	F. Ramer	10	10	0	0	100%
3/26-5/24/91	EMD	Job Specific Reading	V. Woodruff	5	5	0	0	100%

CHART A: Continued

Workplace Literacy Partners for the Manufacturing Industry in Chicago and Cook County

Quarter: July - September 1991

CHART A: COURSE STATISTICS

DATES	SITE	COURSE	INSTRUCTOR	# OF STUDENTS ENROLLED	SUCCESSES	FAILURES	DROPS	% OF SUCCESS
4/8-6/26/91	Multigraphics	E.S.L. Company Course	B. Newman	14	13	1	0	93%
4/8-6/26/91	Duraco	E.S.L. Company Course	L. Porter	15	10	0	5	100%
4/9-5/15/91	Duraco	Advanced E.S.L. Tutoring in Reading & Writing	L. Porter	3	3	0	0	100%
4/9-5/30/91	Duraco	E.S.L. Company Course	L. Porter	12	8	0	4	100%
4/9-6/27/91	Multigraphics	Company Specific Math	B. Newman	13	8	2	3	80%
4/17-6/27/91	Bretford-Schiller Park	E.S.L. Company Course	L. Hebbel	6	5	0	1	100%
4/23-6/27/91	Multigraphics	Company Specific Reading	J. Oswald	3	3	0	0	100%
5/13-7/10-91	Briskin	E.S.L. Company Course	L. Schnell	6	5	1	0	80%
5/13-7/10/91	Briskin	E.S.L. Company Course	L. Schnell	8	6	0	2	100%
5/28-7/25/91	Bretford-Wood Dale	E.S.L. Company Course	C. Perillo	5	3	0	2	100%
5/28-7/25/91	Bretford-Wood Dale	E.S.L. Company Course	C. Perillo	3	2	0	1	100%
6/24-7/17/91	Bloomfield	Clerical Level Reading & Math Course	C. Poindexter	5	4	0	1	100%

:HART A: Continued

Workplace Literacy Partners for the Manufacturing Industry in Chicago and Cook County

)uarter: October - December 1991

CHART A: COURSE STATISTICS

DATES	SITE	COURSE	INSTRUCTOR	# OF STUDENTS ENROLLED	SUCCESSES	FAILURES	DROPS	% OF SUCCESS
7/15 - 9/25	Hudson	E.S.L./Reading	K. Meier	6	6	0	0	100%
7/15 - 9/25	Hudson	E.S.L.	V. Oshana	6	5	1	0	83%
7/15 - 8/28	Integrity	E.S.L.	L. Schnell	11	9	1	1	90%
7/16 - 8/39	Integrity	E.S.L.	L. Schnell	10	9	0	1	100%
7/16 - 7/19	Bloomfield	Telephone Etiquette	C. Poindexter	4	4	0	0	100%
7/29 - 9/9	Bloomfield	Communication Skills Enhancement	D.Jones	8	8	0	0	100%
7/29 - 9/30	Courtesy	E.S.L.	L. Schnell	4	4	0	0	100%
7/31 - 9/30	Courtesy	E.S.L.	L. Schnell	4	4	0	0	100%
8/2 - 9/27	Courtesy	E.S.L.	L. Schnell	3	3	0	0	100%
8/6 - 9/26	Hudson	Writing	D. Acuff	14	14	0	0	100%
8/26 - 9/25	Webster/Hoff	E.S.L.	M. Huseby	6	4	0	2	100%
8/27 - 9/26	Webster/Hoff	E.S.L.	R. Gilmore	10	10	0	0	100%
9/4 - 9/24	DuPage	E.S.L. Intensive	Lynch/Mrowicki	4	4	0	0	100%
9/4 - 9/25	DuPage	E.S.L. Intensive	Lynch/Mrowicki	2	2	0	0	100%
9/3 - 10/14	Integrity	E.S.L.	L. Schnell	10	10	0	0	100%
9/10 - 10/15	Integrity	E.S.L.	L. Schnell	9	9	0	0	100%

CHART A: Continued Workplace Literacy Partners for the Manufacturing Industry in Chicago and Cook County

Quarter: October - December 1991

CHART A: COURSE STATISTICS

DATES	SITE	COURSE	INSTRUCTOR	# OF STUDENTS ENROLLED	SUCCESSES	FAILURES	DROPS	% OF SUCCESS
10/29-12/19	Webster-Hoff	E.S.L.	L. Schnell	13	13	0	0	100%
10/29-12/19	Webster-Hoff	Basic Math	L. Schnell	13	13	0	0	100%
10/30-12/18	Webster-Hoff	E.S.L.	L. Schnell	13	13	0	0	100%
10/30-12/18	Webster-Hoff	Basic Math	L. Schnell	13	13	0	0	100%
11/11-12/18	Intec	Intensive Writing	L. Schnell	9	9	0	0	100%
11/21-12/18	Intec	Intensive Writing	L. Schnell	9	9	0	0	100%

Total # of Students enrolled in classes:	661
Goal :	664
Cumulative % of goal:	99%

Workplace Literacy Partners for the Manufacturing Industry in Chicago and Cook County

Quarter: October - December 1991

LIST OF
CHART B: COMPETENCY-BASED COURSES - MASTERY REQUIRED

DATES	SITE	CORE COMPETENCIES	INSTRUCTOR	# OF ENROLLED STUDENTS	# SUCCESSES	DROPS
9/26 - 12/19	EMD	Job-Specific Math Warehouse	C. Larsen	7	7	0
9/27 - 12/20	EMD	Job-Specific Math Warehouse	C. Larsen	7	3	1
1/7 - 3/20	EMD	Job-Specific Math Reconfiguration	A. Barsanti	6	5	1
1/8 - 3/26	EMD	Job-Specific Math Reconfiguration	A. Barsanti	7	6	1
2/4 - 3/25	EMD	Job-Specific Math Warehouse	C. Larsen	2	1	0
2/4 - 4/15	EMD	Job-Specific Math Warehouse	C. Larsen	2	4	0
2/5 - 3/19	EMD	Job-Specific Math Warehouse	C. Larsen	5	3	1
2/5 - 5/9	EMD	Job-Specific Math Warehouse	C. Atlas	3	3	0
3/4 - 4/10	EMD	Job-Specific Math Warehouse	C. Atlas	2	2	0
3/5 - 5/4	EMD	Job-Specific Math Warehouse (Bilingual)	V. Bastiaans	3	3	0
3/5 - 5/9	EMD	Job-Specific Math Warehouse	C. Atlas	4	4	0
3/27 - 3/27	EMD	Job-Specific Math Warehouse	C. Larsen	1	1	0

HART B: Continued

Workplace Literacy Partners for the Manufacturing Industry in Chicago and Cook County

uarter: October - December 1991

LIST OF
CHART B: COMPETENCY-BASED COURSES - MASTERY REQUIRED

DATES	SITE	CORE COMPETENCIES	INSTRUCTOR	# OF ENROLLED STUDENTS	# SUCCESSES	DROPS
4/2 - 5/7	EMD	Math Review Crankcase	A. Barsanti	5	5	0
4/2 - 6/20	EMD	Math Intensive Crankcase	A. Barsanti	7	7	0
4/3 - 6/19	EMD	Job-Specific Math Crankcase	V. Woodruff	7	7	0
4/4 - 4/4	EMD	Job-Specific Math Warehouse	C. Larsen	1	1	0
4/29 - 5/8	EMD	Pick Ticket Reading	C. Atlas	3	3	0
5/21 - 5/30	EMD	Pick Ticket Reading	C. Atlas	4	4	0
5/23 - 6/20	EMD	Job-Specific Reading Reconfiguration	V. Woodruff	4	4	0
6/10 - 6/19	EMD	Pick Ticket Reading	C. Atlas	4	4	1
7/29 - 8/16	EMD	Job-Specific Math	V. Woodruff	1	1	0
7/8 - 7/17	EMD	Pick Ticket Reading	C. Atlas	4	4	0
7/22 - 8/7	EMD	Job-Specific Math (Math Review)	C. Atlas	1	1	0

Workplace Literacy Partners for the Manufacturing Industry in Chicago and Cook County

uarter: October - December 1991

CUMULATIVE DATA
CHART C: COMPETENCY-BASED COURSES - MASTERY REQUIRED

SITE	CORE COMPETENCIES	# OF ENROLLED STUDENTS	# SUCCESSES
EMD	Job-Specific Math Warehouse	39	33
EMD	Job-Specific Math Reconfiguration	13	11
EMD	Job-Specific Reading Warehouse	16	15
EMD	Job-Specific Math Crankcase	20	20
EMD	Job-Specific Reading Reconfiguration	9	4

Workplace Literacy Partners for the Manufacturing Industry in Chicago and Cook County

CHART D: NUMBER OF PRE-ASSESSMENTS BY QUARTER

	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Quarter 5	Quarter 6	Quarter 7
BLOOMFIELD	9	-	-	-	5	-	-
BRETFORD	-	-	13	8	-	-	-
BRISKIN	-	23	-	-	-	-	-
DUPAGE	-	-	55	-	-	-	-
DURACO	-	-	-	27	27	-	-
EMD	5	136	127	157	136	60	_
MULTIGRAPHICS	-	300	-	-	-	-	-
SHURE BROS.	-	20	29	37	-	-	-
COURTESY	-	-	-	-	-	21	-
HUDSON R.C.I.	-	-	-	-	-	33	-
INTEC	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
INTEGRITY	-	-	-	-	-	55	-
WEBSTER HOFF	-	-	-	-	-	16	-
TOTAL	14	479	224	229	162	185	9
CUMULATIVE % OF GOAL	1%	49%	71%	93%	110%	128%	128%

Goal: 1014

Workplace Literacy Partners for the Manufacturing Industry in Chicago and Cook County

CHART E: NEW COURSES OPENED BY QUARTER*

	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Quarter 5	Quarter 6	Quarter 7
BLOOMFIELD	1	-	-	-	1	2	-
BRETFORD	-	-	2	4	3	-	-
BRISKIN	-	3	-	-	2	-	-
DUPAGE	-	-	2	-	-	2	-
DURACO	-	-	-	-	3	-	-
EMD	1	5	-	11	8	3	-
MULTIGRAPHICS	-	2	2	3	3	-	-
SHURE BROS.	-	2	1	4	-	-	-
COURTESY	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
HUDSON R.C.I.	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
INTEGRITY	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
WEBSTER HOFF	-	-	-	-	-	2	4
INTEC	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
TOTAL	2	12	7	22	20	17	6
CUMULATIVE % OF GOAL	2%	15%	21%	47%	89%	118%	126%

Goal: 68

The number reflects new courses; the total number of new and continuing courses is found in Chart A.

PROJECT WORKPLACE LITERACY FOR THE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY IN CHICAGO AND COOK COUNTY

FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION
Evaluator: Linda Schinke-Llano, Ph.D.

INTRODUCTION

Overview of Project

Project Workplace Literacy for the Manufacturing Industry in Chicago and Cook County is a cooperative venture between four educational agencies and thirteen manufacturers operating from 4/1/90 until 12/31/91, with the final three months being a no-cost extension. Briefly stated, its goals are to improve the productivity of the manufacturing industry by providing workplace literacy instruction to both native English speakers and limited English speakers and to improve the ability of educational programs to meet the needs of the manufacturing industry by developing a curriculum resource guide.

The educational agencies include The Center, whose projects have a long and successful history of providing educational programs and teacher training; S. D. #214, whose Continuing Community Education Program has a large staff of ESL, ABE, and GED instructors; Travelers' and Immigrants' Aid (TIA), whose counseling and job placement programs have served immigrants, refugees, and native-born for over a century; and Management Association of Illinois (MAI), whose clients have included over 2,000 small and medium-sized manufacturing companies. The eight manufacturing firms include Bloomfield Industries; Bretford Manufacturing; Briskin Co.; DuPage Diecasting; Duraco, Inc.; Electro-Motive Division (EMD) of General Motors; Multigraphics; and Shure Brothers Electronics. Five other firms (Courtesy, Intec, Integrity, Hudson R.C.I., and Webster Huff) were added during the last few months of the project period.

Evaluation Process

Focus. As established by the project proposal, the evaluation focused on the assessment of three areas:

1. Project Effectiveness: Were the project procedures both appropriate and of high quality?

2. Project Efficiency: Were the proposed activities achieved in a timely manner?

3. Project Impact: Did the project have positive results in the workplace?

Guiding Questions. In order to reach conclusions about the three areas of focus, two specific evaluation questions framed the data collection:

1. Objectives: Were the nine project objectives met? (If so, to what degree? If not, what were the mitigating factors?)

2. Goals: Were the two project goals achieved? (If so, to what degree? If not, what factors prevented success?)

Additional Inquiry. Given the assumption that other agencies and firms should benefit from the experiences of such a project as this, inquiries were made regarding suggestions for other workplace literacy projects. In short, what beneficial information can be gleaned from this project that can aid future workplace literacy projects?

Sources of Data. In order to answer the questions posed in the sections above, four sources of data were used:

1. Interviews and Site Visits: Ten on-site visits were made to the manufacturing firms (two of the eight had two sites), and two visits were made to The Center, where the project is administered. During these visits 29 interviews were conducted with the following people: project director, MAI representative, 2 coordinators, 2 site supervisors, 4 instructors, 10 company contacts, 2 company supervisors, and 7 employees enrolled in classes.

2. Class Observations: Four classes, including both ESL and basic skills classes, at four different manufacturing firms were observed.

3. Questionnaires: A questionnaire based on project objectives outlined in the proposal was sent to contact people at the manufacturing firms. A questionnaire focusing on project management and content was distributed to instructors. (Copies of both documents are included in Appendices A and B.)

4. Supplementary Material: Quarterly reports and curricular materials were examined to obtain further data.

FINDINGS: PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Information included under each of the following nine objectives reflects data taken from the questionnaires completed by the contact people at the manufacturing firms, as well from inter-

views conducted with them. (Note: Six questionnaires were returned. Exact tabulations of responses are included on the Site Contact Questionnaire in Appendix A.)

1. **To conduct literacy audits and needs assessments for eight manufacturing companies by month 2.** (Refer to items 1.1-1.5 of the Site Contact Questionnaire.) Nineteen positive and three negative responses were given to the questions associated with this objective. Of the contact people who had been involved with the audits and assessments at the outset of the project, all but one reported that these had been conducted "efficiently and on a timely basis." The one negative respondent (from Duraco) indicated that the delay was caused not by the project management, but by his firm's "not being prepared to commit to the project in the second month." Given a positive response rate of over 86% (over 90% if Duraco is discounted), it can be concluded that objective 1 was met.

2. **To develop and select assessment instruments for eight companies by month 2.** (Refer to items 2.6-2.10.) Nineteen positive responses and three negative responses were recorded. One of the negative responses belongs to the individual who explained that the firm had caused the delay; the other two negative respondents offered no explanation. Again, given the over 86% positive response rate (over 90% if Duraco is again discounted), it can be concluded that objective 2 was met.

3. **To identify competencies and basic skills for eight manufacturers and develop customized curriculum by month 13.** (Refer to items 3.11-3.14.) Nineteen positive responses and one negative response were reported, giving a positive response rate of 95%. Thus, it is evident that objective 3 was met.

4. **To select and train 15 workplace literacy instructors by month 3 and as needed.** (Refer to items 4.15-4.17.) Personnel records indicate that this objective was exceeded. The project selected and trained 21 workplace literacy instructors, with one site coordinator and two site supervisors serving double duty as instructors. Four of the six respondents reported visiting classes anywhere from one to four times over the course of the project. Four also reported offering suggestions to the instructors and having those suggestions attended to. On a scale of 1-5 (with 5 being highest), the instructors received an average rating of 4.9. One respondent stated, "The instruction and rapport built with the employees was impressive." Thus, not only were the requisite instructors hired and trained as proposed, but the employers were also pleased with their performance.

5. **To recruit and pre-test 1014 workers by month 13.** (Refer to items 5.18-5.19.) The project recruited and pre-tested 1293 employees, thereby exceeding the objective by 28%. With respect to methods of recruitment, a variety of strategies was used at all locations; however, the success of recruitment efforts varied from workplace to workplace. The process received an average rating of 3.2 on a 1-5 scale, with 5 being the highest rating. One respondent wrote: "Good process, but poor results. We were not able to get enough of the employees who needed it most to go to classes." In contrast, another wrote: "I think the success of the recruiting was also due to a high level of interest on the employees' part." Despite the variation from site to site, the key finding is that the total number of employees recruited and pretested exceeded the proposed objective.

6. **To schedule 68 classes and provide instruction to 664 participants by month 15.** (Refer to items 6.20-6.21.) The total number of participants was 661, only 3 short the objective. The total number of courses, however, was 86; thus, this part of the objective was exceeded by over 26%. Although this objective was met, it is important to note that there was variation from site to site with respect to individual projected numbers. Explanations for this variation depended on the company. In some instances, there had been layoffs, thus reducing the number of eligible workers. In others, shift changes and overtime affected the number of participants. In yet other situations in which classes were conducted after work hours, transportation and childcare factors reduced the number of workers who could enroll or continue participation. Finally, one respondent reported that "response was overwhelming when the program was introduced. [However] not all were able to participate [at the outset] due to small class size. [Thus] enthusiasm and interest waned." Although these situations lessened the success of this particular objective, it is important to note that such problems are endemic to workplace programs.

7. **To measure the learning of 664 participating workers by month 15.** (Refer to items 7.22-7.25.) As already discussed in objective 6 above, 661 workers were served, only 3 short of the objective. Regarding the questions associated with this objective, eighteen of the twenty responses were affirmative, giving a positive response rating of over 88%. One respondent indicated that feedback on the workers' progress was given verbally, and another reported that followup with the supervisors was conducted by the company rather than by the project management. Again, given both the total number of workers served and the high positive response rate, it is concluded that this objective was met.

8. **To produce the Basic Skills Curriculum Resource Guide for the manufacturing industry.** (Refer to items 8.26-8.27.) All respondents reported having no knowledge of such a guide being in progress. However, clearly all knew that company and job-specific materials had been developed, and all respondents expressed satisfaction with the quality and specificity of curriculum. It should be noted that the curriculum resource guide was to be produced as a culminating activity based on the experiences of the entire project; thus, participating companies were not actively involved with the development of the guide at the time the questionnaire was distributed.

9. **To disseminate the Basic Skills Curriculum Guide.** (Refer to items 9.28-9.30.) Since none of the respondents was familiar with the guide at the time the questionnaire was distributed, the question about recommending its use was moot (9.28). However, respondents unanimously agreed that they would recommend continuation of workplace literacy classes at their own firms and that they would recommend the establishment of such classes to other businesses and industries. Both conclusions reflect the degree of satisfaction with the curricula that were tailor-made to the companies' needs.

FINDINGS: PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS, EFFICIENCY, AND IMPACT

Information presented under each of the following sections reflects data gathered from both site contact and instructor questionnaires, as well as from supporting materials and interviews with all individuals listed on page 2. (Note: Six instructors returned questionnaires. Exact tabulations for these are included in the sample Instructor Questionnaire in Appendix B.)

1. **Project Effectiveness** is defined by the proposal as the quality and appropriateness of program procedures. According to the responses to the Site Contact Questionnaires, it is apparent that the manufacturing representatives were pleased with the services provided. Comments given during interviews reinforced this view. For example, several indicated their satisfaction that curriculum materials were tailor-made for the workers. Others commented that instructors dealt equally well with workers and management.

   Instructors' responses, particularly to items 6-10, are pertinent, as well. Reactions varied from a low of 2.5 on question 7 (with only two individuals responding) regarding appropriateness and accuracy of the basic skills assessment to a high of 4.17 on question 8 pertaining to the appropriateness of the classroom materials used. (A 1-5 scale was used, with 5 being the highest rating.) Two instructors

reported that the classes were too multi-level for effective teaching, with one indicating that attrition on the part of lower level workers was directly attributable to this fact. On the positive side, instructors reported being satisfied with the length of each course, the number of contact hours per week, the size of the classes, and the specificity of the materials.

Finally, workers' reactions are important to this section. Those interviewed liked the specificity of the materials used, felt that their skills (both ESL and basic) had improved as a direct result of the classes, and reported using their newly acquired skills both in and out of work.

2. **Project efficiency** is explained by the proposal as timeliness of completion of proposed tasks. Again, the positive responses on the Site Contact Questionnaire support the conclusion that the project was run efficiently.

   Interview comments, many of them about specific individuals, reinforce this position. For example, project director Linda Mrowicki was praised for providing "quality management", "continuity", and "good communication." Coordinator Monica Lynch was described as "one of the best in the business", and coordinator Tess Locsin was described as "one couldn't ask for more." Site coordinators Doug Jones and Carol Larsen were both commended for their rapport with workers, management, and instructors. There is no question that such quality personnel accounted for the efficient running of the project.

3. **Project impact** refers to the effect of the project in the workplace as determined by increased productivity, cost savings, successful participation in company training, job retention, and safety. Most of these criteria are difficult to measure due both to the inability to control variables in cause-effect relationships and to their long-range nature. Quarterly reports of the project, however, indicate increased productivity, improved attendance, and increased self-esteem for virtually all workers who participated. Further, success rates ranging from 58% to 100% were reported for participants.

   Interview comments complement these findings. With respect to limited-English workers, one employer reported their being more willing to initiate conversations; another found better pronunciation and more grammatical accuracy, the result being better communication with co-workers and with supervisors. Regarding those workers who received basic skills instruction, two employers indicated a lowering of the error rate on job tasks. Also, as stated previously, all would recommend continuation of the project at their

worksite, and several indicated that such projects should regularly be considered part of a company's training responsibilities.

Workers, too, had praise for the positive effect of the classes. In addition to the comments presented in the section on project effectiveness, workers reported increased self-confidence and renewed positive attitudes towards their respective companies. One described the basic skills classes as "the best thing that's come along in this company."

FINDINGS: PROJECT GOALS

Comments included under each of the two goals listed below represent a synthesis of findings revealed through an analysis of adherence to project objectives and to the three areas of focus of efficiency, effectiveness, and impact as reported above.

1. **To improve the productivity and efficiency of the manufacturing industry by providing workplace literacy instruction to those workers who lack the basic skills required for their jobs.** As already stated in the section above on project impact, it is virtually impossible to claim a direct causal relationship between a single variable in workers' lives and their on-the-job performance. Despite this disclaimer, it is obvious that company management, workers, and instructors alike saw positive changes in workers' attitudes and performances, which they attributed to the project. As stated above, these changes ranged from increased self-confidence to a lower rate of error on job tasks.

2. **To improve the ability of educational programs to meet the basic skill needs of the manufacturing industry by developing a curriculum resource guide.** As previously indicated, all workers and management representatives interviewed reported satisfaction with the specificity and usefulness of curricular materials developed. There is no question that this project team knows how to assess workplace literacy needs and to develop appropriate materials. Such knowledge summarized in a curriculum resource guide will be of considerable assistance to other agencies intending to begin such projects and will eliminate considerable trial and error on their part.

CONCLUSION

Project goals and objectives were met, with the number of employees recruited and pre-tested and the number of classes taught exceeding the proposed numbers, and with the total number of

employees served falling only slightly short of the proposed number. Once again, this shortfall was not due to any failure on the part of project management. Rather, realities of the workplace (lay-offs, shift changes, management personnel changes, and the sale of companies), as well as realities of workers' lives (transportation and childcare factors) account for the discrepancy.

Company officials and workers alike showed satisfaction with the services provided and were pleased with the results obtained. Clearly, the positive impact of this project is attributable to the individual and collective efficiency and effectiveness of all members of the project--project director, coordinators, site supervisors, and instructors. Other workplace literacy projects would do well to replicate their work.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORKPLACE LITERACY PROJECTS

Based on the experiences of this project, the following general recommendations can be made regarding the implementation of other workplace literacy projects:

1. Keep the time between proposal writing and project funding to a minimum to lessen the possibility of management changes, as well as other variables that will affect project success.

2. Keep the time between project funding and class implementation to a minimum in order to maintain worker enthusiasm.

3. Be realistic about the number of workers who will benefit from the project. The actual number is much smaller than the potential number due to workplace and personal variables that are not under the control of the project management.

4. In companies where a union is present, be sure that union and management are in agreement regarding the implementation and conduct of the project.

5. To the degree possible, avoid multi-level classes with extremely varied ability levels of workers.

6. Provide a consistently available classroom that has adequate lighting, seating, table space, chalkboard, among other characteristics.

This list, while by no means exhaustive, may help other workplace literacy projects to avoid pitfalls and to maximize their potential for success.

Petersburg, IL--12/91

APPENDIX A

SITE CONTACT QUESTIONNAIRE
PROJECT WORKPLACE LITERACY
August, 1991

Instructions: Unless otherwise indicated, please complete this questionnaire using the following code:

Y = yes N = no 0 = don't know or not applicable

Objective 1: **To conduct literacy audits and needs assessments for eight manufacturing companies by month 2.**

1.1 Was a literacy audit conducted at your workplace to determine the frequency with which reading, writing, and math skills were used by workers on the job? _____

1.2 Was a needs assessment conducted to determine the extent of reading, writing, and math skills needed? _____

1.3 Were the literacy audit and needs assessment completed by the end of the second month of the project (i.e., by May 31, 1990)? _____

1.4 Did you have an opportunity to provide input for the literacy audit and needs assessment? _____

1.5 Did you receive feedback on the results of the literacy audit and needs assessment? _____

Please feel free to provide comments on any of the above items, especially any that you may have responded to with a no.

_____

86% positive response

_____

Objective 2: **To develop and select assessment instruments for eight companies by month ?.**

2.6 Were general skills tests (on reading, writing, and math) administered to workers prior to the beginning of classes? _____

2.7 Were specific job skills assessments administered to workers prior to the beginning of classes? _____

2.8 Were you asked to provide input for the development of the specific job skills assessment? _____

2.9 Were the general skills test and the specific job skills test administered by the end of the second month of the project (i.e., by May 31, 1990)? _____

2.10 Did you receive feedback on the results of the assessments (i.e., on group rather than individual performances)? _____

Comments? _____

86% positive response

Objective 3: **To identify competencies and basic skills for eight manufacturers and develop customized curriculum by month 13.**

3.11 Were necessary competencies and basic skills identified for your workers? _____

3.12 Were appropriate instructional materials developed? _____

3.13 Did you have the opportunity to provide input for the development of instructional materials? _____

3.14 Were instructional materials developed by the end of April, 1991? _____

Comments? _____

95% positive response

Objective 4: **To select and train 15 workplace literacy instructors by month 3 and as needed.**

4.15 Have you observed the teaching of any of the instructors at your site? _____

If so, approximately how many times? _____

4.16 Did you ever offer suggestions to the instructors? _____

If so, was the suggestion attended to? _____

4.17 How would you rate the quality of the instruction on a scale of 1 - 5, 5 being highest? 4.0

Comments? _____

80% positive response

Objective 5: **To recruit and pre-test 1014 workers by month 13.**

5.18 Did you use the following at your workplace to recruit workers for classes?

posters _____

flyers _____

group meetings _____

individual encouragement/invitation _____

other (specify)_____ _____

5.19 How would you rate the recruiting process on a scale of 1 - 5, 5 being highest? 3.2

Comments?_____

_____

_____

Objective 6: **To schedule 68 classes and provide instruction to 664 participants by month 15.**

6.20 According to the proposal, an estimated total of ____ workers were to take classes at your site. Was this goal met? 100%

If not, what in your opinion accounts for the goal's not being met?_____

_____

6.21 According to the proposal, ____ class modules were to be scheduled over the duration of the project. Was this goal met? 100%

If not, what in your opinion accounts for the goal's not being met?_____

_____

Comments?_____

_____

_____

Objective 7: **To measure the learning of 664 participating workers by month 15.**

7.22 Were records of ongoing progress of workers kept? _____

7.23 Was a post-test administered to workers at the end of their course work? _____

7.24 Did you receive feedback on the ongoing progress and post-test performance of workers enrolled in the classes (i.e., of groups rather than individuals)? _____

7.25 Was followup done with supervisors to monitor the job performance of workers after their course work was completed? _____

Comments? _____

89% positive response

Objective 8: **To produce the Basic Skills Curriculum Resource Guide for the manufacturing industry.**

8.26 Do you see a value in the production of such a guide? _____

8.27 Did you have an opportunity to provide input for or reaction to the guide? _____

Comments? _____

0% positive response--see comments on page 5

Objective 9: **To disseminate the Basic Skills Curriculum Guide.**

9.28 Would you recommend use of the guide to other businesses and industries? _____

9.29 Would you recommend workplace literacy classes to other businesses and industries? _____

9.30 Would you recommend that workplace literacy classes be held again at your own workplace? _____

Comments? _____

100% positive response--see comments on page 5

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONNAIRE
PROJECT WORKPLACE LITERACY
August, 1991

Note: This is an anonymous questionnaire. Individual results will not be reported; rather, a group profile will be developed. You may, of course, include your name if you wish.

Please rate the items listed below using the following rating:

0 = don't know or not applicable
1 = poor
2 = below average
3 = average
4 = above average
5 = excellent

1.	Pre-service orientation and training regarding project goals, operating procedures, etc.	3.2
2.	On-going information (via meetings, calls, memos) during the course of the project	3.3
3.	Communication with the project director	3.5
4.	Communication with the site coordinator	4.2
5.	Communication with the workplace contact person	4.0
6.	Appropriateness and accuracy of the basic skills assessment given learners prior to the courses	3.8
7.	Appropriateness and accuracy of the special skills assessment given learners prior to the courses	2.5
8.	Appropriateness of the classroom materials used	4.2
9.	Appropriateness and accuracy of post-testing	4.0
10.	Progress of the learners	3.5

Please feel free to comment on any of the above items on the lines below. Don't forget to include the item number.

_____

_____

_____

_____

PLEASE CONTINUE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.

11. Identify 1-3 strengths of this project.

12. Identify 1-3 weaknesses of this project.

13. What suggestions would you have for workplace contacts, site coordinators, and/or project directors of any future such projects in order to best facilitate the work of instructors?

Thank you for your time. Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed envelope **no later than August 31** to:

Linda Schinke-Llano
R. R. 3 Box 210
862 Spruce
Petersburg, IL 62675

VI. Report on any changes in key personnel.

There were NO changes in key personnel during the project.